

REMARKS

Claims 1, 7, 16 and 17 have been amended. Claims 18 and 19 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. New claims 20-25 have been added. Accordingly, claims 1-12, 16, 17 and 20-25 are now pending in this application.

Amendments to the Specification

Applicants have removed the term "multiplexed digital signature" from the specification, as requested by the Examiner. Applicants note that the common definition of "multiplex" is "relating to, having, or consisting of multiple elements or parts." (See, e.g., The American Heritage® Dictionary of the English Language, 4th Ed., Houghton Mifflin Company, 2000.) In using the term "multiplexed digital signature" Applicants were merely seeking to more concisely characterize the invention whereby a digital signature is applied to data and another digital signature is additionally superimposed on the resulting digital signature, hence, obtaining a multipart digital signature.

Rejection of claim 17 under 35 USC § 112

In response to the Examiner's rejection of claim 17 under 35 USC § 112 on similar grounds as discussed above, Applicants have removed the term "multiplex" from amended claim 17.

Restriction of Claims 18 and 19

Claims 18 and 19 were withdrawn by the Examiner as being directed to an invention that is independent and distinct from the invention originally claimed.

Claims 18 and 19 have been canceled.

35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1-12 and 16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being anticipated by Brown et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,671,805 - hereafter "Brown") in view of Romney et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,872,848 - hereafter "Romney"). These rejections are traversed as follows.

On page 7 of the Office Action, it is asserted that Romney shows a "frame" around the portion of data that is to be signed (citing indicators 610, 630, 650 of FIG. 6 of Romney and column 8, lines 40-46). However, rather than showing or suggesting a frame, all Romney shows are delimiters between different data types. In particular, Romney teaches a "beginning of signed message indicator" 610 located before the copy 620 of the original document; a "beginning of digital signature indicator" 630 located above the digital signature 640, and an "end of digital signature indicator" 650 located beneath the digital signature. Thus, Romney's delimiter for dividing data to be signed from signature information (such as an encrypted hash value and a signature version) is essentially different in concept from Applicants' claimed invention in which a detected range of partial data is displayed as a frame surrounding the content of said partial data, and which is displayed on the

screen on which the entire data of the digital signature data is displayed. Romney does not display the detected range of partial data as a frame, and does not teach a frame surrounding the content of the partial data. Rather, Romney merely indicates the beginning or end of a type of data. Accordingly, Romney cannot be combined with Brown to arrive at Applicants' invention, and claims 1 and 7 are allowable over the combination of Brown and Romney and/or the other art of record.

Further, with respect to new claims 20 and 23, the art of record does not teach or suggest verifying an overlying signature, i.e., applying another digital signature on data digitally signed. (For support, see, e.g., FIG. 14 of the present application and corresponding text). Specifically, it is not taught or suggested that a display frame of said digital signature object data surrounds a display frame of another digital signature object data, the signer information and the verification result.

Also, with respect to new claims 21-22 and 24-25, the art of record does not teach or suggest a plurality of digital signatures applied by repetitive processing and determination of whether undisplayed or unanalyzed digital signatures remain. (These claims find support, e.g., at steps 302-305 of FIG. 3 and steps 402-405 of FIG. 4.) Accordingly, new claims 20-25 are allowable over the art of record.

Conclusion

Should the Examiner feel that a telephonic or in-person interview would be useful to advance prosecution of the application, the Examiner is encouraged to contact Applicants' undersigned attorney.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Colin D. Barnitz", followed by a horizontal line extending to the right.

Colin D. Barnitz
Registration No. 35,061

MATTINGLY, STANGER, MALUR & BRUNDIDGE, P.C.
1800 Diagonal Rd., Suite 370
Alexandria, Virginia 22314
(703) 684-1120
Date: June 16, 2006